


**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

<b>SINCERE TERRY et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiffs,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Case No. CIV-22-522-G</b>
	)	
<b>CITY OF OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER**

Now before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Motion for Status Conference (Doc. No. 60), seeking a hearing to address the status of the case and motions pending before the Court.<sup>1</sup> Orders on the pending motions are forthcoming, and the Court does not believe that a status conference would be helpful at this time. If a status conference or other hearing becomes necessary, the Court will set such a hearing by separate order. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ Motion (Doc. No. 60) is DENIED at this time.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 30th day of September, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHARLES B. GOODWIN  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs’ Motion represents that “Defendants do not object to the relief requested.” *See* Pls.’ Mot. at 2. Defendant Prater later filed an Objection (Doc. No. 61), however, representing that if he had known that Plaintiffs intended to attach affidavits to the instant Motion, *see* Doc. Nos. 60-1, 60-2, 60-3, 60-4, 60-5, 60-6, he would have objected to the Motion. Defendant’s objection is noted.